

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 are currently pending in the application. The office action initially rejected claims 1-32 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Grube et al., U.S. Pat. 5,602,916. Claims 1, 20, 21, 31, and 32 are independent claims in the application.

In regard to claim 1, the claim language has been amended to more clearly present the claimed embodiment. Namely, the claim has been amended to recite "**preventing operation at a lower level of security until information is received by the system to authorize a decrease in security levels; while continuing operation of said processing system**". The office action stated that Grube prevents operation at a lower level of security by causing the process to end. The claim language recited above prevents operation at a lower level of security without causing processing to end. As recited in the claim, the act of "continuing operation of said processing system" is implemented while "preventing operation at a lower level of security." Thus, the Grube reference fails to teach the claimed method since according to the office action Grube teaches that processing must be terminated in order to accomplish the act of preventing operation at a lower level of security. Claim 1 is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance, since the Grube reference fails to teach each and every element of the claim. Claims 2-19 depend from claim 1; therefore, they are believed to be in condition for allowance for the same reason(s) that claim 1 is allowable.

In regard to claim 20, the office action indicates that it is rejected for the same reasons that claims 1 and 12 were rejected. Claim 20 recites an element of "**continuing operation of the system at the high level of security until an encrypted authorization message is received by the system from the outside source authorizing a switch to a different level of security**". As was noted in regard to claim 1, the Grube reference does not teach continuing operation of the system at a high level of security. Rather, the office action stated that Grube teaches that processing must be terminated in order to accomplish the act of preventing operation at a lower level of security. Therefore, Grube fails to teach each and every element of the claim under 35 USC §102. Thus, it is believed that claim 20 is in condition for allowance.

In regard to claim 21, the claim language has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed embodiment. Claim 21 recites the element of **"code means for decrypting a Decreased Security Authorization Code"**. The Grube reference does not make use of a Decreased Security Authorization Code. Hence, the Grube reference does not possibly teach code means for decrypting a Decreased Security Authorization Code. Rather, the Grube reference appears to deal with a Security Gateway that establishes secure communication with a communication unit in order to transmit requested data. The security level is predetermined and indicated by look up tables at the security gateway. So, there is no contemplation that security level would ever be changed during transmission of the data. Therefore, claim 21 is believed to be allowable as amended. Claims 22-26 and 28-30 depend from claim 21. Therefore, these claims are allowable for the same reasons that claim 21 is allowable. The amendments to claims 28 and 29 merely correct dependencies due to cancellation of claim 27.

In regard to claim 31, it contains the following elements:

"transmitting a Decreased-Security-Authorization Code to change from said first level of decryption to a second level of decryption" and **"receiving said Decreased-Security-Authorization-Code"**. Both of these elements require the a Decreased-Security-Authorization-Code. The remarks in regard to claim 21 are hereby incorporated by reference for claim 31. For the same reason that claim 21 is allowable, claim 31 is also allowable.

In regard to claim 32, it recites **"code means for transmitting a Decreased-Security-Authorization-Code from said transmitter to said receiver so as to change from said first level of encryption to a second level of encryption"**. The remarks in regard to claim 21 are hereby incorporated by reference for claim 32. For the same reason that claim 21 is allowable, claim 32 is also allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/576,516
Amdt. dated February 9, 2004
Reply to Office Action of December 22, 2003

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



William F. Vobach
Reg. No. 39,411

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300

WFV:klb
60122696 v1